



## A STUDY ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO POWER GENERATION INDUSTRIES AND ITS IMPACT ON EMPLOYEES

**Dr. Giriraj Kiradoo**

**Associate Professor (Reader)  
Department of Management & Technology  
Govt. Engineering College, Bikaner**

### **Abstract**

Organizations have recently begun focusing on the level of engagement of their employees in an effort to understand the underlying factors of employee motivation and performance (Gallup, 2005). Employee engagement is integral to driving successful organizations. Engaged employees are satisfied and feel a sense of attachment to their job and employer. They promote the very best in the organization to their friends and family and work towards its success. Engagement with one's work is important, given that work is a pervasive and influential part of an individual's well-being, affecting not only the quality of an individual's life but one's mental and physical health as well (Wrzesniewski, Rozin, & Bennett, 2002). Most people must work to earn a living, which makes work an obligation rather than a choice. However, despite this apparent lack of choice, individual experiences with work are quite diverse, ranging from work as a monotonous grind to work as an expression of one's identity (Hulin, 2002). Level of employee engagement is a predictor of both individual and organizational performance.

**Keyword:** Employee Motivation and Performance, Employee Engagement, Mental and Physical Health

### **Introduction**

The concept of employee engagement was introduced by Kahn in 1990 and has been visible in the literature for two decades. The construct was picked up by human resource consultants who marketed it to the commercial world, causing a wave of interest that academic research continues to struggle to catch up with (Macey & Schneider, 2008). For instance, by 2001, the Gallup Organization (2001) had rolled out its engagement survey to over 1.5 million employees, and claimed boosting 'worker engagement is a logical pathway to higher profits' and 'the potential gains are highest in the top [engagement] performing groups'.

Scholars and practitioners in the HRM field tend to agree that the fundamental concept of engagement may help explain behaviour at work, but they present different definitions of it.



Thus, while the concept of employee engagement seems on the surface to be compelling, the concept lacks clarity in its definition. The purpose of this section is to discuss the conceptual disparities among different schools of thought on the definition of employee engagement in order to develop a conceptual foundation for this study.

### **Review of literature**

Academic research in engagement produced diverse theories in the mid-2000s, and, in 2008, there was a general, yet short-lived, consensus among researchers who conceptualised engagement as an ‘aggregate multidimensional construct’ (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 18). However, the possibility that engagement may operate differently in different contexts has been overlooked. None of the researchers who developed theories and measures of constructs for engagement at this time reported such *a priori* exploration of potential differences. Findings are only now beginning to acknowledge that context should be considered in studies of engagement (Albrecht, 2010). It is the potential contextual differences in employee engagement across power sector employees population that is the subject of this thesis.

### **Research Methodology**

Employee Engagement initiatives has significant impact on Discretionary effort, Intend to stay, Emotional and Rational commitment of employees. The study will have broad research which will propose the impact of Employee Engagement initiatives on employees in power generation industries. It will be based on detailed study of different activities / policies carried out by the power industries for their employees. The employee engagement scores will be based on Education, Age, Total Experience, Tenure with the company etc.

### **Objectives of Study**

1. To understand whether demographic profile of employees leads to differences in employee engagement.
2. To find out any discrepancies or deficiencies which could hamper the engagement level of employees.

### **Hypothesis**

H0: There is no significant difference in employee engagement based on Total Experience



H1: There is significant difference in employee engagement based on Total Experience

**Limitations of the Research:**

- An underlying assumption for the entire study is that the details and the feedback received from the population are true.
- The conclusions are drawn on the basis of the information collected from the respondents.

**Data analysis**

*ANOVA Table*

This is the table that shows the output of the ANOVA analysis and whether there is a statistically significant difference between our group means. We can see that the significance value is 0.000 (i.e.,  $p = .000$ ), which is below 0.05. and, therefore, there is a statistically significant difference in the mean of experience of the employee and employee engagement.

| ANOVA                     |                |                |      |             |        |      |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|-------------|--------|------|
|                           |                | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
| Job engagement            | Between Groups | 185.500        | 3    | 61.833      | 17.076 | .000 |
|                           | Within Groups  | 2447.781       | 1735 | 3.621       |        |      |
|                           | Total          | 2633.281       | 1738 |             |        |      |
| Emotional engagement      | Between Groups | 146.102        | 3    | 48.701      | 14.660 | .000 |
|                           | Within Groups  | 2245.661       | 1735 | 3.322       |        |      |
|                           | Total          | 2391.763       | 1738 |             |        |      |
| Organizational engagement | Between Groups | 125.474        | 3    | 41.825      | 11.816 | .000 |



|                             |                |          |      |        |        |      |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------|------|--------|--------|------|
|                             | Within Groups  | 2392.879 | 1735 | 3.540  |        |      |
|                             | Total          | 2518.353 | 1738 |        |        |      |
| Creative process engagement | Between Groups | 161.926  | 3    | 53.975 | 15.363 | .000 |
|                             | Within Groups  | 2374.955 | 1735 | 3.513  |        |      |
|                             | Total          | 2536.881 | 1738 |        |        |      |

From the above calculations we can **reject** null hypothesis H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant difference in employee engagement based on Total Experience and **accept** alternate hypothesis H<sub>1</sub>: There is significant difference in employee engagement based on Total Experience

### Findings

- Out of 1739 respondents, 28.29% respondent's age is in the range of 20-29 years, 46.21% respondents are in the age group of 30-39 years, 18% respondents are in the age group of 40-49 years, 7.50% respondents age is more than 50 years.
- 33% respondents never feels any personal accomplishment with their work, while 13% respondents feels accomplishment with their work rarely, 25% respondent sometimes feels accomplishment with their work, 17% respondent feels personal accomplishment with their work very oftenly and lastly 12% respondents always feels personal accomplishment with their work.
- 7% respondents strongly disagree with the statement 'Awareness about work is related to the organization's goals and priorities', while 3% respondents are not agree with the statement, 5% respondent are neutral with the statement, 33% respondent agree with the statement and lastly 52% respondents strongly agree with the statement..
- 31% respondents strongly disagree with the statement 'their job inspires them', while 20% respondents are not agree with the statement, 18% respondent are neutral with the statement, 16% respondent agree with the statement and lastly 15% respondents strongly agree with the statement..
- Out of 1739 respondents, 34% respondents are not at all satisfied with information they received from the management while 28% are somewhat satisfied, 10%



respondents are neutral with the information, 13% respondents are satisfied with information they received from the management whereas 15% respondents are very much satisfied with information they received from the management.

- Out of 1739 respondents, 26% respondents strongly disagree with the statement 'they generate a significant number of alternatives to the same problem', while 16% respondents are not agree with the statement, 16% respondent are neutral with the statement, 20% respondent agree with the statement and lastly 22% respondents strongly agree with the statement..
- Out of 1739 respondent, 35% respondents feels that they will recommend their friends for working in the organization while 44% respondents don't do it whereas 21% respondents may be recommend their friends for working in the organization.
- Out of 1739 respondents, 38% respondents strongly disagree with the statement 'employee love to come for work', while 22% respondents are not agree with the statement, 14% respondent are neutral with the statement, 11% respondent agree with the statement and lastly 15% respondents strongly agree with the statement..

## **Conclusion**

- Majority of respondents feel that they don't have sufficient resources to work, while only few are not feeling so.
- Most of the respondents feel that they are not getting real opportunity to explore their skill in the current organization.
- Majority of respondents are not satisfied with their level of involvement in decision making.
- Majority of respondents agree and strongly agree with the statement 'employee engagement helps in improved profitability'.
- Engagement strategies consist of a diverse of tools which are useful for elevating the human resources in order to attain the ideal level of efficiency. There is a prerequisite in the organizations to generate an environment where modern methods can be executed in engagement with an energy and passion as is happening in private sector organizations.
- Measuring employee engagement does not increase engagement or customer response. It is a creativity created to categorize employee engagement with work and trust in the company leading to action plans for founding a truly involved workforce that creates internal value, promises organizations of employment stability and in effect, positions organizations for nonstop development and success. Thus, organizations today are actively looking forward to closely with and proceed on behalf of their employee's expectations and performances.



- Personal relationships have also been found to impact work engagement. Research has specified that family stress is related to work stress. However, the causal relationship between the two variables is uncertain. Relationships within the workplace have also been found to have an impact on ‘meaningfulness’, which relates to engagement. Locke and Taylor (1990) specified that such findings point to the likeness needs individuals possess, arguing individuals who have rewarding interpersonal interactions with their co-workers also should experience greater meaning in their work. Demographic factors alone cannot predict an individual’s inclination to be engaged. More significant here is the way in which people are managed. Management style, employee voice and job design impact on people’s level of engagement, regardless of demographic variables.

#### **References:**

- Asif, M., &Muneer, T. (2007). Energy supply, its demand and security issues for developed and emerging economies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 11(7), 1388-1413.
- Benitez, L E., Benitez, P C., & Van Kooten, G C. (2008). The economics of wind power with energy storage. *Energy Economics*, 30(4), 1973-1989.
- Bhattacharyya, S. C. (2001). *Energy Economics: Concepts, Issues, Markets and Governance*: 31 Springer. Blanco, M I. (2009). The economics of wind energy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 13(6), 1372-1382.
- Ehnberg, S., &Bollen, M.H. (2005). Reliability of a small power system using solar power and hydro. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 74(1), 119-127.
-